

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 62-71 are now pending. Applicant has amended claim 1, 62, and 68.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for her time and consideration during the telephone interview on May 12, 2006. As a result of the interview the Examiner agreed that Fisher does not suggest that an input value for an attribute is received "from the user's computer system." Applicant has amended claims 1 and 62 to make this explicit.

The Examiner has rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, and 62-71 over Fisher in view of Walker; claim 4 over Fisher and Walker in view of Mori; claim 5 over Fisher and Walker in view of Ching; claim 7 over Fisher and Walker in view of Boesjes; and claim 10 over Fisher and Walker in view of Odom. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to make explicit the computer system from which the input value is received.

Applicants' technique facilitates commercial transactions by providing price information for items having specific attributes. To enable this technique, items are classified using a versatile organization of item classifications. For example, a diamond ring may be associated with a "diamond rings" item classification, as well as a "jewelry" item classification. Each one of the item classifications may have its own set of attributes or attribute types. Referring to the diamond ring example, items in the "jewelry" classification may have the attributes "condition" and "color," while items in the "diamond rings" classification may include, by contrast, "condition," "color," "clarity" and "cut."

Using the technique described above, users can search for price information about products meeting specific criteria. A user interested in diamond rings, after selecting the classification "diamond rings," is able to specify values for each of the attributes associated with the specific diamond rings of interest to them: "condition = good," "color = white," "clarity = very clear" and "cut = princess." For a different item classification, different attributes would be available for the user to specify (e.g., a

search for 'automotive price information may allow the user to supply "make," "model," "year," and "mileage"). The system then retrieves transactions for items that are in the selected classification and matches the received input values supplied by the user to analyze them and generate price information to present to the user.

Fisher's technique is an electronic product catalog that allows users to drill down into the catalog and select a product of interest (e.g., a DVD player). Once a product is selected, Fisher selects a template for the product and generates a web page with product information formatted according to the template. The template indicates the layout of the product attributes on the web page.

Fisher also provides a service that allows vendors to upload product information and then subsequently modify how those products appear. Fisher allows vendors to design "templates" to specify the manner in which their product catalog is displayed (Fisher, 4:21-29). When a user clicks on a link on a web page of Fisher's catalog, Fisher is able to use control information in the link to search for the template as designed by the vendor to display product information in the way the vendor intended (Fisher, 11:9-21; 11:50-59).

Walker's technique is directed to providing potential sellers information about the market for their product. Potential sellers are allowed to supply, for example, the class and type of the item. Product information is relatively fixed as noted in Walker's Figure 7, where a book, a camera and a watch all have three places for information about "peripherals." It should be noted that a seller is limited as to the information they are able to provide about the item.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies upon Fisher's browsing and displaying of product information to a user as corresponding to the first four steps of claim 1, which are "providing an item classification/attribute mapping," "receiving a selection," "identifying the set of attributes," and "providing a display of an indication." The Examiner also relies on Fisher for the fifth step of claim 1, which is "receiving an input value." In particular, the Examiner points to Fisher's Stock Unit Attributes table. This table is loaded by a vendor with the attribute names and corresponding values for the products to be included in the catalog. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the

Examiner's correspondence of the first four steps to Fisher's browsing and displaying is correct, the correspondence for Applicants' fifth step cannot be correct, as the corresponding step in Fisher does not allow the browsing user to provide value for an attribute as recited in Applicants' fifth step. Rather, Fisher only allows a vendor to provide a value when uploading product information. Note: Figure 5 and 8:66-10:26 of Fisher explain the buyer's experience when using the system. There is nothing in Fisher to suggest that the buyer or user inputs the value for an attribute.

As suggested during the interview, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 62 to make it clear that the input value for an attribute is received "from a user's computer" rather than from a seller's computer.

Independent claim 68 is directed to allowing a seller to retrieve records of transactions based on an item classification and condition value received from the seller's computer system. Although Fisher allows a vendor to upload attribute values for products of a catalog, neither Fisher nor Walker suggests that the vendor-uploaded attribute values can be used as values for "retrieving records of transactions for items that have condition values that match the specified condition value" as now more explicitly recited by claim 68. Rather, a vendor uploads attributes values to specify the attributes of the products that the vendor is selling. The uploaded attribute values are simply stored in a database as part of a product catalog.

Based upon the amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests re-consideration of this application in view of this preliminary amendment. If the Examiner has any questions or matters that can be expediently handled by telephone, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: *5-30-06*

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio
Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-9548 (fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000